



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



3 3433 05751548 2

*The
Gordon Lester Ford
Collection
Presented by his Sons
Worthington Chauncey Ford
and
Paul Leicester Ford
to the
New York Public Library.*







PROTESTANT UNION.

A TREATISE OF TRUE RELIGION,

HERESY,

SCHISM, TOLERATION,

AND

WHAT BEST MEANS MAY BE USED

AGAINST

THE GROWTH OF POPERY.

By JOHN MILTON.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

A PREFACE

ON

MILTON'S RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES,

AND

UNIMPEACHABLE SINCERITY.

By THOMAS BURGESS, D.D. F.R.S. F.A.S. P.R.S.L.

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

LONDON:

F. AND C. RIVINGTON, WATERLOO PLACE; AND
J. HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY.

MDCCCXXVI.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

P41239

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATION
1899.

“ Milton appears to have felt full conviction of the truth of Christianity, and to have been untainted with any heretical peculiarity of opinion.”

JOHNSON.

“ From every heretical peculiarity of opinion he was free.”

TODD.

“ His theological opinions were orthodox, and consistent with the Creed of the Church of England.”

SYMMONS.

To the Memory

OF THE LATE

HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND

SHUTE BARRINGTON, LL.D.

THE LEARNED, THE PIOUS, THE BENEFICENT,

THE GOOD

BISHOP OF DURHAM,

THE FOLLOWING PAGES,

ON A SUBJECT IN WHICH HE FELT A DEEP INTEREST,

ARE INSCRIBED,

BY HIS AFFECTIONATE FRIEND,

T. SARUM.

*N.C.

1. *Pharmaceutical industry* – The pharmaceutical industry is the largest of the three industries, with sales of \$10.5 billion in 1997. It is the only industry that has not experienced a decline in sales since 1990. The industry is dominated by a few large firms, with the top five firms accounting for 40% of sales. The industry is highly competitive, with many firms competing for market share.

• *Staphylococcus aureus* (Staph aureus)

... ..

For the purpose of this study, the following hypotheses were formulated:

Journal of Management Education 30(6)

1000

100

Fac-simile of Bishop Barringtons hand writing in his Ninety second Year.

My Beloved Lord, Can I speak
Decr 2. 1828.

You continue to press
a good press, & I shall be
ready for the intents &
Christianity & The Church of
England that you may prove
victorious. —————

I am,

Your Affectionate friend

J. Barrington.

In the third line after really, the word anxious seems wanting.

GENERAL CONTENTS.

- I.—Preface on Milton's Religious Principles and unimpeachable Sincerity.
- II.—Postscript on Mr. Todd's Account of the Treatise *De Doctrina Christiana*, in his late Edition of the Life of Milton.
- III.—Contents of Milton's Treatise of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration, and what best Means may be used against the Growth of Popery.
- IV.—Milton's Treatise of True Religion, &c.
- V.—Appendix of Extracts from Lord Monboddo's Origin and Progress of Language; and from the Edinburgh Review; on *the Style of Milton*.
-


Shortly will be Published,
AN ADDRESS
TO
THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF LITERATURE,
DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT,
AT THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING,
April 27, 1826.
TO WHICH WILL BE ADDED,
MILTON CONTRASTED WITH MILTON,
AND WITH
THE SCRIPTURES.

PREFACE.

THE last thoughts, on any doctrine of religion, of a mind so learned, so powerful, so pious, and so deeply conversant with the Scriptures as Milton's was, are of importance in ascertaining both the truth of the doctrine in question, and the real character of his own religious sentiments. The *last eight years* of his life were distinguished by the publication of the most splendid monuments of his piety and genius—his *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*. The *last two years* produced his *Treatise on True Religion*, with the second editions of his *Ode on the Nativity*, and of his *Paradise Lost*.

“The last thing that Milton wrote,” says Toland, “(and *that* was published a little before his death) was the Treatise of *True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration, and the best Means that may be used to prevent the Growth of Popery.*”

Few, even of ecclesiastical writers, have left so many evidences of their religious principles, in so many different periods of not a short life, as our great Christian poet has done, from his twenty-first to his sixty-sixth year. If, according to a common division of human life, we divide Milton's life into three periods,—his youth ending with his twenty-fourth year, the last of his academical course (1632), his middle age ending with his fiftieth year (1658), and his old age with his sixty-sixth year (1674), we may verify the orthodoxy of the several periods from his printed works: of his *youth* from his



Ode on the Nativity, and of his *middle* age, from his Treatises on *Reformation in England*, and on *Prelatical Episcopacy*, and from his *System of Divinity*, collected from Trinitarian writers, Amesius and Wollebius. In this *middle* period, even his letters written in the names of Oliver and Richard Cromwell (1654—1658), in favour of the Vaudois, and his Sonnet on the Massacre of Piedmont, afford evidence of his orthodoxy; for what he says of the “pure faith” of the Vaudois, and of the “orthodox Church,” and “orthodox religion,” of these Trinitarian Christians, could not have been said by any Arian or Socinian.

So abundant and indisputable are the evidences of Milton's orthodoxy, in his *youth* and his *middle* age, as late as his fiftieth year (1658), that Richardson says, “I claim, in his behalf, that

he be esteemed as continuing so to the last *."

The printed works of the *last period* also of Milton's life contain most undoubted proofs of his piety and orthodoxy; yet Richardson observes that, "Some conjectured that Milton was an Arian, on account of certain passages in one of the works of this last period, his *Paradise Lost*." He treats this charge, however, as a mere conjecture; and adds that, "two learned and pious Divines had very lately expressly acquitted him of this charge *." The imputation, indeed, is disproved, not only by various particular expressions in the Poem, which no Arian could have used, but by the Trinitarian principles on which the Poem is formed and conducted.

Another conjecture, not better founded, concerning a supposed alteration in Mil-

* Richardson's Explanatory Notes, p. xlix.

ton's religious sentiments, was proposed by Dr. Birch, in a note on Milton's *Treatise on Reformation*. "It appears," he says, "that Milton, in his younger years, was orthodox, as it is called; but he afterwards altered his sentiments, as is plain from his *Tract on True Religion, Heresy, Schism, and Toleration*, which was the last work he published*." Dr. Birch's opinion was adopted by the writer of Milton's Life, in the *Biographia Britannica*, who quotes from Milton's *Tract* the paragraph relative to the disputes of Arians and Socinians against the Trinity, as a proof of Milton's altered sentiments,—a passage, which, in my opinion, proves the very reverse of Dr. Birch's conjecture, as I have shewn in a note on the passage. The paragraph is, indeed, obscured by a long parenthesis, so

* Milton's Prose Works, vol. i. p. 4, ed. Birch.

that the sense of the passage, as well as the drift of the whole Tract, is entirely misunderstood by Dr. Birch and the Annotator.

The object of Milton in this Tract was to form a general PROTESTANT UNION, by uniting Protestants of all denominations against the Church of Rome, (which he styles "the common adversary" of the Protestant religion,) not by any compromise of their peculiar tenets, but by a comprehensive toleration grounded on the general Protestant principle of making the Bible *only* the rule of their faith. And as all Protestants profess to acknowledge that common rule, he recommends to them to overlook all matters "not essential to belief," and all opinions "not destructive to faith." And therefore, though he does not advise *communion* with opinions *destructive to faith*, yet, for the sake of


his proposed union against the Church of Rome, he recommends an equal toleration of all sects who profess to ground their opinions, though erroneous, on the Bible only. "Error," he says, "is not heresy;" and he determines nothing to be heresy, but a wilful alienation from, or addition to, the Scriptures; and consequently Popery to be the only or the greatest heresy. He admits that Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Arminians, Arians, and Socinians may have some *errors*, but they are not heretics, according to his definition, because they all profess to make the Bible *only* the rule of their faith. "The Lutherans," he says, "hold consubstantiation, an *error* indeed, but not mortal." He successively enumerates the opinions of Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Arians, Socinians, and Arminians, accordingly as they differ

from the commonly received doctrines of the Christian Church. But "God," he says, "will assuredly pardon all sincere inquirers after truth, though *mistaken* in some points of doctrine." And, speaking of the founders or revivers of such opinions in past times, he adds, "That God having made no man infallible, hath pardoned their involuntary *errors*."

Milton evidently treats *their* several opinions as *deviations* or *errors* from the commonly received doctrines of the Christian Church. He was, therefore, not a Lutheran, nor Calvinist, nor Anabaptist, nor Arian, or Socinian, nor Arminian. Of the Arians, and Socinians, he speaks in more pointed terms than of the rest. He calls their opinions "*disputes against the Trinity, and the satisfaction of Christ*;" declaring the latter opinion to be of *less moment* than the former, because in the

latter, they acknowledge Christ to be "God and their Saviour." This opinion he pronounces to be of *less moment*, because it *apparently* acknowledges the Divinity and the Atonement of Christ. The former opinion, by which they deny Christ to be *one God* with the Father, he, consequently, considered of *greater moment*, because, in denying the essential unity of the Son with the Father, they deny the *true Divinity* of Christ. This opinion he expressly condemns by calling the disputes against the Trinity *sophistic subtleties*,—but the doctrine itself, a *plain doctrine in Scripture*; and in this he agrees with the opinions of his middle age, that "he is an unfaithful expounder of Scripture who goes about to prove an imparity between God the Father, and God the Son;" and that "the Arians were no true friends of Christ."

In 1672, two years before his death, and one year before the publication of the following treatise, he published his *Artis Logicæ plenior Institutio*, in which he plainly shows himself not to be an Arian. In his chapter *De Forma* (lib. i. c. 7), he observes, “*Quæ numero, essentia quoque differunt; et nequaquam numero, nisi essentia differrent.*” The conclusion which an Arian would draw from this principle is, that as they who are two numerically, must be two essentially, the Son of God is not essentially one with the Father. The Arian writer *De Doctrina Christiana* does employ the logical principle for this express purpose (p. 65). But what does Milton say? “*Let Theologians here be on their guard:*”
EVIGILENT HIC THEOLOGI. Why does he put Theologians on their guard? evidently that they may not draw the



conclusion which the Arian writer has done. For he supplies the principle, which obviates the Arian conclusion. "The essence of almost every thing is partly common, partly proper or peculiar : " *Cujusque fere rei essentia est partim communis, partim propria.* From which it follows, that they who are essentially two in one respect, may be essentially one in another *. Milton does not exemplify this

* The terms *substance, essence, form,* must here, of course, not be understood in their ordinary meanings. " Things may differ in number and essence, and yet not in substance : *Si quæcunque numero, essentia quoque differunt, nec tamen materia,*" &c. " *Substance* constitutes the *common essence* of things, and *form* the *proper* or *peculiar* : *Communem essentiam materia constituit, forma propriam.*" " *Essence* is that which *distinguishes* one thing from another : *Essentia est totum illud quod rei proprium est.*" " *Form* is that *by which* one thing is distinguished from another, or which gives to every thing its *proper essence* : *Forma*

conclusion from theology. I shall therefore endeavour to illustrate the principle from the doctrine to which he obviously alludes. And I shall do so, not to prove the doctrine of the Trinity from an abstract principle

dat proprium esse rei." "The *rational soul* is the form of man *in genere*: *Anima rationalis forma hominis in genere est*; *anima Socratis, forma Socratis propria*."

May we now, "unblamed," extend these considerations to our conceptions of the Deity. Supreme intellect, or Supreme wisdom (*summa ratio*), is the *forma Dei in genere*,—the common essence or substance of Deity. The wisdom of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is, respectively and in each, the proper form,—the *essentia propria*,—the hypostasis or person,—by which the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are distinguished from each other. THE THREE, though numerically, and therefore essentially different in person, are essentially one in their common essence or substance. *Μονον* and *ιμορτασις* are terms used by St. Paul of the Deity. Great caution is necessary not to connect with the terms *Father* and *Son*, when applied to the Deity, any ideas similar to those of human derivation.

(because the evidence of the doctrine in the Bible supersedes such proof), but to illustrate the abstract principle from what we *know* of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Bible; namely, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are not one Person, but three Omnipresent Persons of the Deity. Admitting this *postulate*, we proceed. *E. g.* Two entirely distinct substances cannot occupy the same place at one and the same time. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are omnipresent, and occupy all space at one and the same time. They are, therefore, not entirely distinct substances. Again, whatever occupies any one place at one and the same time, must be individually one. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit occupy all space at one and the same time; they are, therefore, individually one,—not entirely distinct

substances, but three hypostases of one common substance,—*una et individua Trinitas*,—three persons of one Deity, or, as Milton elsewhere expresses himself, “one tripersonal Godhead.”

It appears, then, from Milton's printed works of his youth, his middle age, and his old age, that his religious principles were Trinitarian, and unaltered through life. Born, and educated, and graduated in the Church of England, he was *not*, as Richardson erroneously asserts *, “*ever a dissenter from the Church of England as established by law.*” When he left her communion, it was merely because he was averse to her discipline. The measures of Archbishop Laud, and the privations of his exiled friend and preceptor, YOUNG, appear to have first alienated him

* Explanatory Notes, p. xxxix.

from the discipline of the Church. Averse to the government of the Church, as then conducted, he became successively Puritan, Presbyterian, and Independent, without relinquishing his religious principles; for *those sects were all Trinitarian in doctrine**. He thought them all intolerant of one another, and he finally left them all; and, after his blindness, ceased to communicate with any public congregation of Christians. But, disgusted as he was with the intolerance of the Presbyterians, and dissatisfied as he must have been with Cromwell's usurped sovereignty, he appears, from this Tract on True Reli-

* "The occasion of the separation of the *Brownists* [Independents] was not any fault they found with the faith, but only with the discipline and form of Government of the other Churches in England." (Rees's Cyclopædia, Article *Brownists*), an unexceptionable authority on such a question.

gion, to have returned, in heart at least and principle, to the Church of England. In 1641, the thirty-third year of his age, before the overthrow of the Church, he bore testimony to the *purity of doctrine*, as professed by the Church of England. "Albeit in purity of doctrine we agree with our brethren," [the rest of the reformed Churches,] "yet, in discipline, we are no better than a schism from all the Reformation, while we hold ordination to belong only to Bishops;" thus identifying himself, at that time, with the members of the Episcopal Church, although he was averse to its government. At that time he speaks of England as "most unsettled in the enjoyment of that peace whereof she taught the way to others." But, in 1673, he says, It was the rejoicing of all good men, that "God had given a heart to the people

to remember still their great and happy deliverance from popish thralldom, and to esteem highly the precious benefit of his Gospel, so freely and peaceably enjoyed among them*.” He does not scruple, in this quiet evening of his life, to quote the Articles of the Church of England, and to appeal to her authority †; and again identifies himself with the members of the Church of England in contrasting it with the Church of Rome. “The papal Antichristian Church permits not her Laity to read the Bible in their own language. *Our Church*, on the contrary, hath proposed it to all men, and to this end translated it into English ‡.”

Milton, who had been instrumental in the subversion of the Monarchy and the

* Of True Religion, p. 1, in this volume.

† Ibid. p. 4. 15.

‡ Ibid. p. 22.

Church, experienced in himself, at the Restoration, an eminent proof of the lenity of a kingly government; (a lenity deserved by the immortal merits of his youth, the *Ode on the Nativity*, *Comus*, and *Lycidas*; blest and rewarded in the fruits of his old age, *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*!); and he has, in the following Treatise, gratefully shown how highly he estimated its protection in what he says of the free and peaceable enjoyment of the Gospel in this country, in the first sentence of the following *Treatise of True Religion*.

The enmities which Milton excited by his writings against the Monarchy and the Church exposed him to many calumnies, and charges of heresy, impiety, and even atheism. Dr. Johnson's detractions from our great Poet's merits may be almost always traced to some prejudice,

political or religious. But it is difficult to account either for the virulence or the incorrectness of Bishop Horsley's censure of Milton, on account of a passage in his *Defensio pro P. A.* "When Salmasius," says Dr. Horsley, "upbraided Cromwell's
"faction with the tenets of the Brownists,
"the chosen advocate of the execrable
"faction [Milton] replied, that if *they*
"were Brownists, Luther, Calvin, Bucer,
"Zuinglius, and all the most celebrated
"Theologians of the Orthodox must
"be included in the same reproach.
"A grosser falsehood, as far as Luther,
"Calvin, and many others are concerned,
"never fell from the unprincipled pen of
"a party writer*." The following are Milton's own words: "*Quereris enim postremis hisce sæculis disciplinæ vigorem laxatum, regulam corruptam, quod uni scilicet tyranno cunctis legibus soluto,*

* Sermons, Vol. ii. Appendix, ed. 1824.

disciplinam omnem laxare, mores omnium corrumpere, impune non liceat. Hanc doctrinam ‘Brunistas inter Reformatos’ introduxisse ais. Ita Lutherus, Calvinus, Zuinglius, Bucerus, et Orthodoxorum quotquot celeberrimi theologi fuere, *tuo judicio* Brunistæ sunt. Quo æquiore animo tua maledicta perferunt Angli, cum in Ecclesiæ doctores præstantissimos, *totamque adeo ecclesiam reformatam*, iisdem prope contumeliis debacchari te audiant*.”

In this passage Milton certainly does not say that the Reformers were Brownists; but he argues on the supposition that Salmasius has said it, or implied it; and he infers that the people of England “may well be content “to bear an imputation which they “share in common with the most excellent Doctors of the Church.” The

* Defensio pro P. A., c. v. ad fin.

passage of Salmasius is as follows : “ Postremis vero sæculis, ut in aliis rebus, ita et in hac, mores, ut jam dictum, cum temporibus mutati sunt, disciplinæ vigor laxatus est, et regula corrupta. Quinimo extitere tandem pestes rerum publicarum, regumque *μαστιγες*, et omnis a Deo ordinatæ potestatis hostes, sophistæ quidam, qui contrariam illi, quæ a Christo tradita est, doctrinam introduxerunt de occidendis quasi jure regibus, si displicerent subjectis. Tales in Pontificiis Jesuitæ, inter Reformatos, qui vocantur Independentes et Brunistæ*.”

It is evident that Milton does not *make* the comparison imputed to him by Bishop Horsley, but considers it to be *made* or *implied* by Salmasius's assertion, that the *doctrina de occidendis regibus* originated,

* Defensio Regia, edit. 12mo. 1649, p. 169.

with the Reformers, because it was taught by a sect of the Reformed Church. “*Ita Lutherus, &c. tuo judicio Brunistæ sunt.*”

In another passage* Salmasius says, “that it will be called the doctrine of the Reformed Church, because they who profess to be Reformed, Puritans, and Saints, have lately put the atrocious doctrine in practice. ‘*Quid nunc respondebimus Jesuitis? Quo ore, qua fronte nos Reformati ipsis imputabimus, quod habeant doctrinam regibus infensam, in regum necem armatam, et populos ad rebellionem incitantem? Qua sunt malitia præditi, et qua calumniandi cupiditate ardent, non sibi extorqueri sinent, quin hæc doctrina propria sit Reformatis, quam et tam belle in usum norint convertere; quia pro Reformatis, Catharis, et Sanctis se jactant, qui*

* Defensio Regia, edit. 12mo. 1649, p. 84.



tam infandum facinus nuper commiserint. Tros Rutulusve fuat, nullo habebunt discrimine. *Omnes, qui se Reformatos dicunt, pro Independentibus habebunt, et ἀναρχίας vitio laborantibus.*” The Independents, or Brownists, are here identified with the whole Reformed Church. To the same effect he says (p. 168), *Quis non miretur Anglos gentiles reverentiores suorum regum fuisse quam Anglos Christianos? Plus adhuc dicam, quam Anglos Reformatos?*

Milton's argument, therefore, is not, as Bishop Horsley states it, “If Cromwell's party were Brownists, the Reformers were Brownists;” but “if the Reformers are (Salmasii judicio) stigmatized as Brownists, Cromwell's party may be very content to bear the same reproach.”

Dr. Symmons was as much mistaken in his defence of Milton as Bishop Horsley

was in his censure. "If we admit the
" premises of Milton," he says, "can we
" refuse our consent to his conclusion?
" If to contend for liberty against the
" tyranny of a single person be the dis-
" tinction of a Brownist, the first Re-
" formers were, beyond all question,
" Brownists; for one of the principal
" objects of their liberal and enlightened
" contention was to break the despotism
" of the Court of Rome *." A little con-
sideration might have convinced Dr. Sym-
mons that his premises are not Milton's
premises, and that his conclusion cannot
follow from his premises. The contention
of subjects against a natural sovereign,
whether tyrant or not tyrant, to whom they
have sworn obedience, is so wholly dif-
ferent a case from their contention against

* *Life of Milton*, p. 322, Note, *Prose Works*, vol. vii.



the despotism of the Pope, to whom they owe no obedience, as to bear no comparison with it. The right of subjects to put their sovereign to death, was, according to Salmasius, a tenet of Jesuitism and Brownism. And it would be a most glaring inconsequence to say, "If putting Kings to death be Brownism, the rejection of the Pope's authority is Brownism." Milton would never have called it Brownism to contend against a foreign enemy,—the common enemy of all Protestant Churches,—the pretender to supremacy over all Protestant sovereigns,—and especially against that enemy who, "since " this country has shaken off his Baby-
" Ionish yoke, hath not ceased, by his
" spies and agents, to seduce, corrupt,
" and pervert as many of the people as
" he can;" and who "once employed
" his emissaries to destroy both King and

“Parliament*,” as Milton has expressed himself in the following Treatise †.

Next to Milton’s piety and reverence for the Scriptures, and orthodoxy, his temperance, and “a most severe love of virtue,” his patriotism, and unimpeachable sincerity, one of the most marked features of his character was his aversion to the idolatry, superstitions, and other corruptions of the Church of Rome, against which he thought there was no security but by an entire exclusion of it from toleration, both public and private. The

* Most important discoveries have been made by Mr. Lemon, in the State Paper Office, relative to the Romish priests who were engaged in the plot against Queen Elizabeth, and to the gunpowder treason.—See Townsend’s *Accusations of History* against the Church of Rome, and his *Supplemental Letter*, pp. 283. Note, 295. 443–446. 462. 467.

† P. 16.



Latin writer *De Doctrina Christiana*, on the contrary, thought there was no danger from Popery,—that the reformed religion was sufficiently defended against it. So much at variance, on this and other important subjects, were the sentiments of Milton and the Latin writer.

T. SARUM.

LONDON, May 1826.

NOTE to p. xxxiv.

[*Unimpeachable sincerity.*] To this eminent quality of Milton's character he himself appeals in his *Defensio Secunda* pro P. A. (Prose Works, vol. v. p. 213, ed. Symmons): "Idem hodie animus, eadem vires [he was then in his 46th year] non iidem oculi; ita tamen extrinsecus illæsi, ita sine nube clari ac lucidi, ut eorum qui acutissimum cernunt: *in hac solum parte, memet invito, simulator sum.*" And again, more gravely (p. 215.): "Testor itidem Deum, me nihil istiusmodi

scripsisse, quod non rectum et verum, Deoque gratum esse, et persuaserim tum mihi, et etiamnum persuasus sum ; idque nulla ambitione, lucro, aut gloria ductum ; sed officii, sed honesti, sed pietatis in patriam ratione sola."

He gave a signal proof of his sincerity by the grave and solemn warning which he addressed to Cromwell (after he had usurped the Sovereignty of the country), " that, if he should invade the liberty, which he had " asserted, the consequence would necessarily be pernicious, if not fatal, not only to himself, but to the " general interests of piety and virtue: honour and " virtue would be empty names ; men would have " little faith in religion, and very little esteem for " it: quo gravior generi humano vulnus, post illud " primum, infligi nullum poterit." (Ibid. p. 260.)

The danger which Milton then felt from the situation of his country, and the calamity which he appears to have anticipated, he lived to see realised in the conduct of Cromwell, and in the disorders which intervened between the date of this address to Cromwell (1654) and the year 1659, when he wrote to his friend, Henry Oldenburgh, who wished him to write the history of the commotions which had distracted the country. The wound to religion and virtue, which he feared, had

been inflicted ; and he thus feelingly expresses himself concerning it : “ Ab historia nostrorum motuum concinnanda, quod hortari videris, *longe absum* ; sunt enim *silentio digniores, quam præconio* : nec nobis, qui motuum historiam concinnare, sed qui motus ipsos componere feliciter possit, est opus : tecum enim vereor, ne libertatis ac religionis hostibus, [Regibus et Cardinalibus] nunc nuper sociatis, nimis opportuni inter has nostras civiles discordias, vel potius insanias, videamur ; verum non illi gravius, quam *nosmetipsi jamdiu flagitiis nostris, religioni vulnus intulerint*.” (P. W. vol. vi. p. 141.) This is not the language of an “unprincipled party writer.”

He gave a further proof of his sincerity in the perseverance of his efforts for what he believed to be the good of his country, even after the death of Oliver, and the deposition of Richard Cromwell, which were continued to the very eve of the Restoration, at the hazard of his life, and of the most ignominious requital.

He was, however, fortunately for the honour of his country, and the interests of Christianity, not excepted from the act of indemnity granted to all, who were not immediately concerned in the murder of the King ; and was reserved for another proof of his sincerity in

the refusal of the office of Latin Secretary under the restored Government.

He had given an early proof of his sincerity, however indiscreet, by the freedom of his opinions respecting Popery, while he was in Italy. "He resolved to return," says Bishop Newton, "by the way of Rome, though he was advised to the contrary by the merchants, who had received intelligence from their correspondents, that the English Jesuits there were forming plots against him, in case he should return thither, by reason of the great freedom which he had used in all his discourses of religion. For he had by no means observed the rule recommended to him by Sir Henry Wotton, of keeping his thoughts close, and his countenance open. He had visited Galileo, a prisoner to the Inquisition, for asserting the motion of the earth, and thinking otherwise in astronomy than the Dominicans and Franciscans thought; and though the Marquis of Villa had shown him such distinguishing marks of favour at Naples, yet he told him, at his departure, that he would have shown him much greater, if he had been more reserved in matters of religion. But he had a soul above dissimulation and disguise; he was neither afraid nor ashamed to vindi-

cate the truth ; and if any man had, he had in him, the spirit of an old martyr." (Life of Milton, pp. xviii. xix. ed. Hawkins.)

With such sincerity, fortitude, and piety, it would have been quite as credible, that Milton should have left behind him a posthumous work in defence of passive obedience and of Popery, as that he should have *privately* prepared, and have left in manuscript, an elaborate Socinian or Arian work, to contradict the religious principles which he had *publicly* professed and maintained through his whole life.


Milton's love of liberty was inseparable from moral rectitude ; and his sincerity is most conspicuous in the consistency of his reflections on the profligate conduct of the *Long Parliament*, and of the new *Church government*, written in his history of Britain after the Restoration, with his *censure* of the measures of the Commonwealth, in the last years of the Usurpation, and with his *apprehensions* at the very commencement of the Protectorate, before quoted.

He says, at the beginning of the third book of his History of Britain, that " the same causes which " brought the *ancient Britons*," when free from the dominion of Rome, " to misery and ruin by " liberty, which, rightly used, might have made them

“ happy, brought also *those of late*, after many labours,
“ much bloodshed, and vast expense, to ridiculous
“ frustrations; in whom the like defects, the like
“ miscarriages, notoriously appeared with vices no
“ less hateful and inexcusable.”

“ For a Parliament being called to redress many
“ things, as it was thought,—when once the super-
“ ficial zeal and popular fumes that actuated their
“ new magistracy were cooled and spent in them,
“ strait every one betook himself (setting the Com-
“ monwealth behind, his private ends before) to do
“ as his own profit or ambition led him. Then was
“ justice delayed, and soon denied; spight and favour
“ determined all:” &c.—

“ And if the State were in this plight, Religion was
“ not in much better, to reform which, a certain
“ number of Divines was called, neither chosen by
“ any rule or custom ecclesiastical, &c. These con-
“ scientious men (ere any part of the work done
“ for which they came together, and that on the
“ public salary) wanted not the boldness, to the
“ ignominy and scandal of their pastorlike profession,
“ and especially of their boasted Reformation, to
“ seize into their hands, or not unwillingly to accept
“ (beside one, sometimes two or more of the best



“ livings) collegiate masterships in the Universities,
 “ rich lectures in the city, setting sail to all winds
 “ that might blow gain into their covetous bosoms, by
 “ which means these great rebukers of non-residence,
 “ among so many distant cures, were not ashamed
 “ to be seen so quickly pluralists and non-residents
 “ themselves, to a fearful condemnation doubtless
 “ by their own mouths.”——

“ And well did their disciples manifest themselves
 “ to be no better principled than their teachers; trusted
 “ with committeeships and other gainful offices, upon
 “ their commendation for zealous and (as they sticked
 “ not to term them) godly ones; but executing their
 “ places like children of the devil, unfaithfully, un-
 “ justly, unmercifully, and, where not corruptly,
 “ stupidly. So that between them the teachers, and
 “ these the disciples, there hath not been a more igno-
 “ minious and mortal wound to faith, to piety, to the
 “ work of reformation, nor more cause of blaspheming
 “ given to the enemies of God and truth, since the
 “ first preaching of reformation.”

The preceding passages are extracted from that
 portion of Milton's History of Britain, which was
 suppressed at the first publication of the History,
 in 1670, but was afterwards printed separately in

1681, from a copy in the Earl of Anglesey's possession, under the following title: "Mr. John Milton's Character of the Long Parliament, and Assembly of Divines, in MDCXLI." Toland has most inexcusably misrepresented the subject of the suppressed portion of Milton's History, in calling it an exposure of "the superstitions, pride, and cunning of the Popish monks in the Saxon times," to which it has no relation; instead of what it is—an exposure of "the defects, miscarriages, and vices of the republican Government;" and in stating that it was suppressed by the licensers, because they thought what was said of the monks was meant to apply to Charles the Second's Bishops, though it related solely to the Republican Assembly of Divines. The misrepresentation is the more inexcusable, because this portion of the history, though suppressed in 1670, was published in 1681, seventeen years before the appearance of his Life of Milton, and of his edition of Milton's Prose Works, in which the History was most blameably still left defective. He must have very ill digested such an account of the *liberty* and *religion* of his favourite Republic.

The language in which Milton there speaks of the "execrable faction" by which he was employed in the service of the Commonwealth, and the consistency of




its strictures with the freedom of his warning to Cromwell, in his *Defensio pro P. A.* and of his censure of the flagitious proceedings of the republican Government, in his Letter to Oldenburgh, show, that if he was their "chosen advocate," he was not their flatterer or panegyrist.

Without public virtue, *liberty* and *country* were, in Milton's mind, empty names. What the virtue of the Republican Parliament was, he has told us in the preceding extracts, and in the following passage:—"That faith, which ought to have been
" kept as sacred and inviolable as any thing holy,—
" 'the public faith,'—after infinite sums received, and
" all the wealth of the Church not better employed,
" but swallowed up into a private gulf, was not, ere
" long, ashamed to confess bankrupt. And now,
" besides the sweetness of bribery, and other gain,
" with the love of rule, their own guiltiness, and the
" dreaded name of Just Account, which the people
" had long called for, discovered plainly, that there
" were of their own number who secretly contrived
" and fomented those troubles and combustions in
" the land, which openly they sat to remedy; and
" would continually find such work as should keep
" them from being ever brought to that terrible stand

“ of laying down their authority for lack of new
“ business, or not drawing it out to any length of
“ time, though upon the ruin of a whole nation.”

In the year 1666, when he wrote to his friend Heimbach the last of his familiar letters, the retrospect of the republican period, and of its disastrous troubles, and the want of public virtue in the Government, left impressions on his mind not favourable to the cause in which he had been engaged, or to his country. Pure as his own views were, and captivated as he had been with the fair visions of liberty and patriotism (or *pietas in patriam*, as he preferred to call it), too many of his compatriots had sought any thing but the good of their country. His friend having ascribed to him more virtues than he could gravely admit, Milton says: “ one of them (*pietas in patriam*) has made me an ill return for my devotion to her; for after enchanting me with her fair name, she has almost, if I may so express myself, deprived me of a country: ea me, pulchro nomine delinitum, prope, ut ita dicam, expatriavit.” Disgraced as the name of patriotism had been by its pretended votaries, he could almost disown, or forget, that he had a country. But he consoled himself with the reflection, that the other virtues enumerated by his friend concurred in



showing, that a man's true country is there, where he can live honestly and virtuously. Reliquarum tamen chorus clare concinit: patria est, ubicunque est bene. So the passage should be pointed*.

Such integrity and virtuous patriotism were incompatible with the duplicity of *publicly* professing, *ad extremum vitæ spiritum*, a faith which he believed to be contrary to Scripture, and false, and was, at the same time, *privately* labouring to prove it so.

* In the printed text it is thus: Reliquarum tamen chorus clare concinit. Patria est, ubicunque est bene. which has misled Dr. Symmons in his translation of the words: "The rest, indeed, harmonize more perfectly together. Our country is wherever we can live as we ought." (Life of Milton, p. 456, ed. 1806.) Hayley has given the right sense: "Other virtues, however, join their voices to assure me, that wherever we prosper in rectitude, there is our country." Milton desires his friend to excuse any errors of writing or punctuation in the letter, and to impute them to the ignorance of the boy who wrote it from his dictation; to whom, he says, he was under the miserable necessity of dictating, letter by letter. If Milton had such difficulty in dictating a Latin letter, what must we think of the practicability of dictating, in his blindness, a Latin treatise of seven hundred pages. The whole letter is, on many accounts, connected with the subject of these pages, and too interesting to be omitted.

*Ornatissimo Viro PETRO HEIMBACHIO, Electoris
Brandenburgici Consiliario.*

Si inter tot funera popularium meorum, anno tam gravi ac pestilenti, abreptum me quoque, ut scribis, ex rumore præsertim aliquo credidisti, mirum non est; atque ille rumor apud vestros, ut videtur, homines, si ex eo quod de salute mea solliciti essent, increbuit, non displicet; indicium enim suæ erga me benevolentiae fuisse existimo. Sed Dei benignitate, qui tutum mihi receptum in agris paraverat, et vivo adhuc et valeo; utinam ne inutilis, quicquid muneris in hac vita restat mihi peragendum. Tibi vero tam longo intervallo venisse in mentem mei, pergratum est; quanquam, prout rem verbis exornas, præbere aliquam suspicionem videris, oblitum mei te potius esse, qui tot virtutum diversarum conjugium in me, ut scribis, admirare. Ego certe ex tot conjugiiis numerosam nimis prolem expavescerem, nisi constaret in re arcta, rebusque duris, virtutes ali maxime et vigere: tametsi earum una non ita belle charitatem hospitii mihi reddidit: quam enim politicam tu vocas, ego pietatem in patriam dictam abs te mallet, ea me pulchro nomine delinitum prope, ut ita dicam, expatriavit. Reliquarum tamen chorus clare concinit. Patria est, ubicunque est bene. Finem faciam, si hoc prius abs te impetravero, ut, si quid mendose descriptum aut non interpunctum repereris, id puero, qui hæc excepit, Latine prorsus nescienti velis imputare; cui singulas plane literulas annumerare non sine miseria dictans cogebar. Tua interim viri merita, quem ego adolescentem spei eximiae cognovi, ad tam honestum in principis gratia provexisse te locum, gaudeo, cæteraque fausta omnia et cupio tibi, et spero. Vale.

Londini, Aug. 15, 1666.

POSTSCRIPT.

The three authorities which I have prefixed to this Preface, would alone be decisive of the orthodoxy of Milton's *printed* works, published by himself. I have, however, in the Preface, exemplified his religious principles from his printed works, and his unimpeachable sincerity from his conduct. A posthumous work, therefore, of heterodox doctrines, though bearing the name of Milton, cannot be admitted to be authentic without the most indisputable evidence. If the work *De Doctrina Christiana* had been in Milton's own hand-writing, that would have been an indisputable proof of its authenticity; but he had been blind two years before the supposed commencement of the Latin work. If it had been in the hand-writing of his daughter Deborah, its authenticity could not have been doubted; but, in the year 1655, when this work is supposed to have been commenced, she was not more than three years old. The hand-writing of Edward Philipps would have been good evidence of its authenticity; but there is, I believe, no autograph of Philipps extant to compare with the Latin work. Whether any indisputable proofs may yet be alleged, we shall soon learn from Mr. Todd's new Life of Milton, containing many valuable and interesting papers respecting Milton, discovered by Mr. Lemon, in His Majesty's State Paper Office.

Salisbury, Sept. 4, 1826.

I have read Mr. Todd's recently-published Life of Milton with attention and pleasure. But I find in

his account of the Treatise *De Doctrina Christiana* nothing of that indisputable evidence which is, I think, indispensably necessary to justify the ascription of it to Milton. On the contrary, there is a considerable diminution of the external probabilities which at first appeared almost to supersede inquiry. For in the first report of the MS. it was thought probable, that the first part of the MS. was written by Mary Milton, and the latter part by Edward Philipps, with interlineations and corrections by Mary and Deborah Milton from the dictation of their Father. It has since been discovered by Mr. Lemon, that the first part was not written by Mary Milton, but by a Daniel Skinner, who was a junior Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, "a wild young man," who had absented himself from College without leave, and refused to return on pain of expulsion. It is now conjectured that the second part was not written by Edward Philipps, but by Deborah Milton. The conjecture is founded on the resemblance which it bears to the hand-writing of the Sonnet on the death of Milton's second wife, which has been supposed to be written by Deborah Milton. But for this supposition there is nothing but the most vague tradition. That she had any share in the writing of the present MS. is in the highest degree improbable. If the work was commenced in 1655, as was conjectured by the learned Editor and Translator on the authority of A. Wood, Deborah Milton was at that time an infant of three years old. If it was "completed in his *latest years*," as Mr. Todd thinks (p. 311), it could not be written by her; for she had left her Father *three or four years* before his death, having gone to Ireland, as a companion to a Lady, before which time she had been released, probably, for a year or two, from her literary employment with her Father, that she might learn embroidery and other works suited to her sex.

Besides these deductions from the external evidence, the title of the work in the MS. affords strong grounds

of suspicion. For the original title began, as it does in the fac-simile which the learned Editor has prefixed to his edition, *without* the words *Joannis Miltoni Angli*, which, as well as the word *posthumi*, are evidently *additions* to the original title, like the fraud, which had been committed in 1673, in the name of Selden, by prefixing *Joannis Seldeni Angli* to a work of Alexander Sardo de Ferrara. But of these and many other difficulties respecting the authenticity of the Treatise, I will take another opportunity of giving a full account.

An American Unitarian, in his "Remarks on the Character and Writings of John Milton," has, under the sanction of Milton's name, made the Latin treatise subservient to the cause of Unitarianism. This was to be expected; but his object, it is to be hoped, will be defeated by the entire inconsistency of the Latin work with the religious and moral character of Milton through life, as well as with his style and genius.

T. S.

OF TRUE RELIGION,
HERESY, SCHISM, TOLERATION,

AND

*What best Means may be used against the
Growth of Popery.*

CONTENTS.

	Page
Increase of Popery a trouble and offence to the nation	1
The nation's happy deliverance from Popish thralldom	1
Free and peaceable enjoyment of the Gospel in England	1
Popery often refuted from the writings of the Fathers, and the Councils	2
Eminently so by a late writer	2
Exhortation against Popery by arguments plainer to common apprehension	2
True religion, the true worship and service of God, learnt and believed from the word of God only	2, 3
True religion to be learnt only from God's written revelation	3
All other traditions, or additions, to be rejected...	3

	Page
Articles of the Church of England	4
——— maintain, with all Protestant Churches, that the rule of true religion is in the word of God only ; and that our faith is not to be an implicit faith	4
Importance of these two principles for avoiding schisms and persecutions ; for uniting Pro- testants against the common adversary, and promoting the toleration of all Protestants ...	4
False religion or heresy, a religion taken up and believed from the traditions of men, and additions to the word of God.....	5
Popery the only, or the greatest heresy	5
The obstinate Papist the only heretic	5
The Romish Church the mother of error and school of heresy	6
The title, <i>Roman Catholic</i> , a mere contradiction in terms	6
Sects, in a true Church, as well as in a false	6
Sectaries, followers of any doctrine too much for the teacher's sake	6
Implicit faith, a blind devotedness to teachers	6
Schism a separating of congregations	7
Schisms may be in a true Church, as well as in a false	7

CONTENTS.

lv.

Page

Schism in a true Church needs not tend to the breaking of communion, except where opinions are destructive to faith	7
Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Socinians, and Arminians may have errors, but are no heretics	7
Heresy is in the will and choice professedly against Scripture	7
Error is against the will, in misunderstanding the Scripture	7
ERRORS of Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, &c.	9
Error of Lutherans in the doctrine of con- substantiation	9
Of Calvinists, in making God the author of sin...	9
Of Anabaptists, in denying baptism to infants.....	9
Of Arians and Socinians, in disputes against the Trinity, and the satisfaction of Christ...	9, 10, 11
Sophistic subtleties of Arians and Socinians, in their disputes against the Trinity	11
Their other opinions of less moment	11
Of Arminians, in setting up free will against free grace	11
Their ERRORS pardoned, and pious endeavours accepted by God in all who sincerely search all things according to the rule of Scripture	12

	Page
Protestants cannot persecute one another without abjuring the principles of their religion	12
All Protestants to be equally tolerated in preach- ing, public writing, and the freedom of printing	13
Controverted points of doctrine to be tolerated, which are not slightly grounded in Scripture	13
Nothing indifferent in religion	14
Nothing in religion to be believed or obeyed but from the Word of God only	14
Authority of the Church of England	15
Articles of the Church of England	15
Popery, a double thing to deal with, claiming a two-fold power, ecclesiastical and political	15, 16
Ecclesiastical ever pretended to political—ecclesi- astical authority being the pretence, and political power the object	16
The Pope pretends right to kingdoms and states, especially to this of England	16
————— thrones and unthrones kings	16
————— absolves the people from their obedi- ence to them	16
————— interdicts to whole nations the public worship of God.....	16
Babylonish yoke of Popery	16

CONTENTS.

lvii

Page

The Pope employed his emissaries to destroy both King and Parliament	16
Men so principled, not to be tolerated.....	17
Popery, as being idolatrous, not to be tolerated either in public or private	17
The FIRST MEANS to hinder the growth of Popery is to remove their idolatry	18, 19
Conscience not to be regarded, which is not grounded in Scripture	19
The SECOND MEANS to hinder the growth of Popery is to study the Scripture	22
The <i>Papal</i> Anti-Christian Church permits not the laity to read the Bible in their own language	22
<i>Our Church</i> hath proposed it to all men, and to this end translated it into English.....	22
Popery chiefly upheld by ignorance of the Scriptures	25
The NEXT MEANS to hinder the growth of Popery is to observe the exhortations of the Scrip- ture to mutual forbearance	25
Folly of discord, while the common adversary is in the field.....	25, 26
Papists take advantage of Protestant disputes	26
To resist the common enemy, it concerns us to agree among ourselves	26

	Page
All differences of opinion among Protestants to be tolerated by Protestants ..	26, 27
Study of controversial writings profitable for sharpening the judgment, and establishing the truth	28
The LAST MEANS to hinder the growth of Popery is to amend our lives	29
Where crimes abound, no wonder that Popery also grows apace	29
To crimes of all kinds, Rome opens wide her office with all her faculties, easy confessions, easy absolutions, indulgences, &c. for such as wish to buy their peace with money, rather than with repentance	30
Popery the worst of superstitions, and the heaviest of all God's judgments	32

OF
TRUE RELIGION, HERESY, SCHISM,
TOLERATION :

And what best MEANS may be used against the

GROWTH OF POPERY *.

It is unknown to no man, who knows ought of concernment among us, that the increase of popery is at this day no small trouble and offence to greatest part of the nation ; and the rejoicing of all good men that it is so : the more their rejoicing, that God hath given a heart to the people, to remember still their great and happy deliverance from popish thraldom, and to esteem so highly the precious benefit of his gospel, so freely and so peaceably enjoyed among them. Since therefore


* Printed in the year 1673. Milton died in 1674.

some have already in public with many considerable arguments exhorted the people, to beware the growth of this Romish weed ; I thought it no less than a common duty, to lend my hand, how unable soever, to so good a purpose. I will not now enter into the labyrinth of councils and fathers, an entangled wood, which the papists love to fight in, not with hope of victory, but to obscure the shame of an open overthrow : which yet in that kind of combat, many heretofore, and one of late, hath eminently given them. And such manner of dispute with them to learned men is useful and very commendable. But I shall insist now on what is plainer to common apprehension, and what I have to say, without longer introduction.

True religion is the true worship and service of God, learnt and believed from

the word of God only. No man or angel can know how God would be worshipped and served, unless God reveal it: he hath revealed and taught it us in the holy scriptures by inspired ministers, and in the gospel by his own Son and his Apostles, with strictest command, to reject all other traditions or additions whatsoever. According to that of St. Paul, "Though we or an angel from Heaven preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be anathema, or accursed." And, Deut. iv. 2: "Ye shall not add to the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish aught from it." Rev. xxii. 18, 19: "If any man shall add, &c. If any man shall take away from the words," &c. With good and religious reason therefore all protestant churches with one consent, and particularly the Church of England, in

her thirty-nine articles, artic. 6th, 19th, 20th, 21st, and elsewhere, maintain these two points, as the main principles of true religion; that the rule of true religion is the word of God only: and that their faith ought not to be an implicit faith, that is to believe, though as the church believes, against or without express authority of scripture. And if all protestants, as universally as they hold these two principles, so attentively and religiously would observe them, they would avoid and cut off many debates and contentions, schisms and persecutions, which too oft have been among them, and more firmly unite against the common adversary. For hence it directly follows, that no true protestant can persecute, or not tolerate his fellow-protestant, though dissenting from him in some opinions, but he must flatly deny and renounce these two his




own main principles, whereon true religion is founded ; while he compels his brother from that which he believes as the manifest word of God, to an implicit faith (which he himself condemns) to the endangering of his brother's soul, whether by rash belief, or outward conformity : for " whatsoever is not of faith, is sin."

I will now as briefly show what is false religion or heresy, which will be done as easily : for of contraries the definitions must needs be contrary. Heresy therefore is a religion taken up and believed from the traditions of men, and additions to the word of God. Whence also it follows clearly, that of all known sects, or pretended religions, at this day in Christendom, popery is the only or the greatest heresy : and he who is so forward to brand all others for heretics, the obstinate papist, the only heretic. Hence one

of their own famous writers found just cause to style the Romish church “ Mother of error, school of heresy.” And whereas the papist boasts himself to be a Roman Catholic, it is a mere contradiction, one of the pope’s bulls, as if he should say, universal particular, a catholic schismatic. For catholic in Greek signifies universal: and the christian church was so called, as consisting of all nations to whom the gospel was to be preached, in contradistinction to the jewish church, which consisted for the most part of Jews only.

Sects may be in a true church as well as in a false, when men follow the doctrine too much for the teacher’s sake, whom they think almost infallible; and this becomes, through infirmity, implicit faith; and the name sectary pertains to such a disciple.



Schism is a rent or division in the church, when it comes to the separating of congregations: and may also happen to a true church, as well as to a false; yet in the true needs not tend to the breaking of communion, if they can agree in the right administration of that wherein they communicate, keeping their other opinions to themselves, not being destructive to faith. The pharisees and sadducees were two sects, yet both met together in their common worship of God at Jerusalem. But here the papist will angrily demand, what! are lutherans, calvinists, anabaptists, socinians, arminians, no heretics? I answer, all these may have some errors, but are no heretics. Heresy is in the will and choice professedly against scripture; error is against the will, in misunderstanding the scripture after all sincere endeavours to understand it

rightly: hence it was said well by one of the ancients, " Err I may, but a heretic I will not be." It is a human frailty to err, and no man is infallible here on earth. But so long as all these profess to set the word of God only before them as the rule of faith and obedience; and use all diligence and sincerity of heart, by reading, by learning, by study, by prayer for illumination of the holy spirit, to understand the rule and obey it, they have done what man can do: God will assuredly pardon them, as he did the friends of Job: good and pious men, though much mistaken, as there it appears, in some points of doctrine. But some will say, with christians it is otherwise, whom God hath promised by his spirit to teach all things. True, all things absolutely necessary to salvation: but the hottest disputes among protestants, calmly and charitably inquired into, will

be found less than such. The lutheran holds con-substantiation; an error indeed, but not mortal. The calvinist is taxed with predestination, and to make God the author of sin; not with any dishonourable thought of God, but it may be overzealously asserting his absolute power, not without plea of scripture. The anabaptist is accused of denying infants their right to baptism; again they say, they deny nothing but what the scripture denies them. The arian and socinian are charged to dispute against the Trinity: *they affirm to believe the


* A parenthesis should be placed here, including the reasons which Arians and Socinians assign for their dissent from the received tenets of the Christian Church respecting the doctrine of the *Trinity*. Milton's style of composition abounds with *parentheses*, which are sometimes employed with great beauty, but sometimes to the obscuring of the sense. In the present instance, the parenthesis separates the words *a*

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to scripture and the apostolic creed ; as for terms of trinity, triniunity, coessen-

mystery indeed, so far from their antecedents, *the Trinity*, as to prevent the Annotator on the Life of Milton, in the Biographia Britannica, from perceiving the connection between the concluding clause of the paragraph, and the beginning ; and that, by *their sophistic subtilties*, Milton meant the *disputes of Arians and Socinians* against the Trinity. *They* and *their* opinions are the subjects of the paragraph. “ *They* affirm,” — “ *they* reject,” — “ *their* subtilties,” and “ *their* opinions,” belong solely to the Arian and Socinian. *They*, of all the enumerated sects, are the *only* disputers against the Trinity ; and to their *sophistic subtilties* is opposed the plain doctrine of Scripture concerning it. They reject *our* scholastic terms, we condemn *their* sophistic subtilties. “ The Arian and Socinian are charged to dispute against the Trinity : (——) a mystery indeed in their sophistic subtilties, but in Scripture a plain doctrine.” We have here (together with his *Ode on the Nativity*, and his *Paradise Lost*, both *republished* by him in the *two last* years of his life) a most decisive proof, that Milton adhered, through life, to the religious principles of his youth and middle age.

tiality, tripersonality, and the like, they reject them as scholastic notions, not to be found in scripture, which by a general protestant maxim is plain and perspicuous abundantly to explain its own meaning in the properest words, belonging to so high a matter, and so necessary to be known : a mystery indeed in their sophistical subtilities, but in scripture a plain doctrine. Their other opinions are of less moment. They dispute the satisfaction of Christ, or rather the word "Satisfaction," as not scriptural : but they acknowledge him both God and their saviour. The arminian lastly is condemned for setting up free will against free grace ; but that imputation he disclaims in all his writings, and grounds himself largely upon scripture only. It cannot be denied, that the authors or late revivers of all these sects or opinions were learned, worthy, zealous,

and religious men, as appears by their lives written, and the same of their many eminent and learned followers, perfect and powerful in the scriptures, holy and unblamable in their lives: and it cannot be imagined, that God would desert such painful and zealous labourers in his church, and oftentimes great sufferers for their conscience, to damnable errors and a reprobate sense, who had so often implored the assistance of his spirit; but rather having made no man infallible, that he hath pardoned their errors, and accepts their pious endeavours, sincerely searching all things according to the rule of scripture, with such guidance and direction as they can obtain of God by prayer. What protestant then, who himself maintains the same principles, and disavows all implicit faith, would persecute, and not rather charitably tolerate such men as these,



unless he mean to abjure the principles of his own religion? If it be asked, how far they should be tolerated: I answer, doubtless equally, as being all protestants; that is, on all occasions to give account of their faith, either by arguing, preaching in their several assemblies, public writing, and the freedom of printing. For if the French and Polonian protestants enjoy all this liberty among papists, much more may a protestant justly expect it among protestants; and yet sometimes here among us, the one persecutes the other upon every slight pretence.

But he is wont to say, he enjoins only things indifferent. Let them be so still; who gave him authority to change their nature by enjoining them? if by his own principles, as is proved, he ought to tolerate controverted points of doctrine not slightly grounded on scripture, much more ought

he not impose things indifferent without scripture. In religion nothing is indifferent, but, if it come once to be imposed, is either a command or a prohibition, and so consequently an addition to the word of God, which he professes to disallow. Besides, how unequal, how uncharitable must it needs be, to impose that which his conscience cannot urge him to impose, upon him whose conscience forbids him to obey? What can it be but love of contentions for things not necessary to be done, to molest the conscience of his brother, who holds them necessary to be not done? To conclude, let such a one but call to mind his own principles above mentioned, and he must necessarily grant, that neither he can impose, nor the other believe or obey, aught in religion, but from the word of God only. More amply to understand this, may be read the


14th and 15th chapters to the Romans, and the contents of the 14th, set forth no doubt but with full authority of the church of England; the gloss is this: "Men may not condemn or condemn one the other for things indifferent." And in the 6th article above mentioned, "whatsoever is not read in holy scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man as an article of faith, or necessary to salvation." And certainly what is not so, is not to be required at all; as being an addition to the word of God expressly forbidden.

Thus this long and hot contest, whether protestants ought to tolerate one another, if men will be but rational and not partial, may be ended without need of more words to compose it.

Let us now inquire, whether popery be tolerable or no. Popery is a double

thing to deal with, and claims a twofold power, ecclesiastical and political, both usurped, and the one supporting the other.

But ecclesiastical is ever pretended to political. The pope by this mixed faculty pretends right to kingdoms and states, and especially to this of England, thrones and unthrones kings, and absolves the people from their obedience to them ; sometimes interdicts to whole nations the public worship of God, shutting up their churches: and was wont to drain away greatest part of the wealth of this then miserable land, as part of his patrimony, to maintain the pride and luxury of his court and prelates: and now, since, through the infinite mercy and favour of God, we have shaken off his Babylonish yoke, hath not ceased by his spies and agents, bulls and emissaries, once to destroy both king and parliament — perpetually to seduce, corrupt, and per-



vert as many as they can of the people. Whether therefore it be fit or reasonable to tolerate men thus principled in religion towards the state, I submit it to the consideration of all magistrates, who are best able to provide for their own and the public safety. As for tolerating the exercise of their religion, supposing their state-activities not to be dangerous, I answer, that toleration is either public or private; and the exercise of their religion, as far as it is idolatrous, can be tolerated neither way: not publicly without grievous and unsufferable scandal given to all conscientious beholders; not privately, without great offence to God, declared against all kind of idolatry, though secret. Ezek. viii. 7, 8: " And he brought me to the door of the court, and when I looked, behold a hole in the wall. Then said he unto me, Son of man,

dig now in the wall : and when I digged, behold a door ; and he said unto me, go in, and behold the wicked abominations that they do here." And ver. 12 : "Then said he unto me, Son of man, hast thou seen what the ancients of the house of Israel do in the dark ?" &c. And it appears by the whole chapter, that God was no less offended with these secret idolatries, than with those in public ; and no less provoked, than to bring on and hasten his judgments on the whole land for these, also.

Having shown thus, that popery, as being idolatrous, is not to be tolerated either in public or in private, it must be now thought how to remove it, and hinder the growth thereof,—I mean in our natives, and not foreigners, privileged by the law of nations. Are we to punish them by corporeal punishment, or fines in their

estates, upon account of their religion? I suppose it stands not with the clemency of the gospel more than what appertains to the security of the state; but first we must remove their idolatry, and all the furniture thereof, whether idols, or the mass wherein they adore their God under bread and wine: for the commandment forbids to adore, not only "any graven image, but the likeness of any thing in heaven above or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God." If they say, that by removing their idols we violate their consciences, we have no warrant to regard conscience which is not grounded on scripture: and they themselves confess, in their late defences, that they hold not their images

necessary to salvation, but only as they are enjoined them by tradition.

Shall we condescend to dispute with them? The scripture is our only principle in religion; and by that only they will not be judged, but will add other principles of their own, which, forbidden by the word of God, we cannot assent to. And [in several places of the gospel] the common maxim also in logic is, “against them who deny principles, we are not to dispute.” Let them bound their disputations on the scripture only, and an ordinary protestant, well read in the Bible, may turn and wind their doctors. They will not go about to prove their idolatries by the word of God, but turn to shifts and evasions, and frivolous distinctions: idols they say are laymen’s books, and a great means to stir up pious

thoughts and devotion in the learnedest. I say, they are no means of God's appointing, but plainly the contrary: let them hear the prophets; Jer. x. 8; "The stock is a doctrine of vanities." Hab. ii. 18: "What profiteth the graven image, that the maker thereof hath graven it: the molten image and a teacher of lies?" But they allege in their late answers, that the laws of Moses, given only to the Jews, concern not us under the gospel; and remember not that idolatry is forbidden expressly: but with these wiles and fallacies "compassing sea and land, like the Pharisees of old, to make one proselyte," they lead away privily many simple and ignorant souls, men and women, "and make them twofold more the children of Hell than themselves." Mat. xxiii. 15. But the apostle hath well warned us, I may say, from such deceivers as these, for their

mystery was then working. "I beseech you, brethren," saith he, "mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them; for they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the heart of the simple." Rom. xvi. 17, 18.

The next means to hinder the growth of popery will be, to read duly and diligently the holy scriptures, which, as St. Paul saith to Timothy, who had known them from a child, "are able to make wise unto salvation." And to the whole church of Colossi: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you plentifully, with all wisdom." Col. iii. 16. The papal anti-christian church permits not her laity to read the Bible in their own tongue: our church on the contrary hath proposed it to

all men, and to this end translated it into English, with profitable notes on what is met with obscure, though what is most necessary to be known be still plainest; that all sorts and degrees of men, not understanding the original, may read it in their mother tongue. Neither let the countryman, the tradesman, the lawyer, the physician, the statesman, excuse himself by his much business from the studious reading thereof. Our Saviour saith, Luke x. 41, 42: "Thou art careful and troubled about many things, but one thing is needful." If they were asked, they would be loth to set earthly things, wealth, or honour before the wisdom of salvation. Yet most men in the course and practice of their lives are found to do so; and through unwillingness to take the pains of understanding their religion by their own diligent study, would fain be saved.

by a deputy. Hence comes implicit faith, ever learning and never taught, much hearing and small proficiencie, till want of fundamental knowledge easily turns to superstition or popery : therefore the apostle admonishes, Ephes. iv. 14 : “ That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive.” Every member of the church, at least of any breeding or capacity, so well ought to be grounded in spiritual knowledge, as, if need be, to examine their teachers themselves. Acts xvii. 11 : “ They searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” Rev. ii. 2 : “ Thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not.” How should any private christian try his teachers, unless he be well grounded himself in

the rule of scripture, by which he is taught? As therefore among papists, their ignorance in scripture chiefly upholds popery, so among protestant people, the frequent and serious reading thereof will soonest pull popery down.

Another means to abate popery, arises from the constant reading of scripture, wherein believers, who agree in the main, are every where exhorted to mutual forbearance and charity one towards the other, though dissenting in some opinions. It is written, that the coat of our Saviour was without seam; whence some would infer, that there should be no division in the church of Christ. It should be so indeed; yet seams in the same cloth neither hurt the garment, nor misbecome it; and not only seams, but schisms will be while men are fallible: but if they who dissent in matters not essential to

belief, while the common adversary is in the field, shall stand jarring and pelting at one another, they will be soon routed and subdued. The papist with open mouth makes much advantage of our several opinions ; not that he is able to confute the worst of them, but that we by our continual jangle among ourselves make them worse than they are indeed. To save ourselves therefore, and resist the common enemy, it concerns us mainly to agree within ourselves, that with joint forces we may not only hold our own, but get ground ; and why should we not ? The gospel commands us to tolerate one another, though of various opinions, and hath promised a good and happy event thereof ; Phil. iii. 15 ; “ Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded ; and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto

you." And we are bid, 1 Thess. v. 21 :
" Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." St. Paul judged, that not only to tolerate, but to examine and prove all things, was no danger to our holding fast that which is good. How shall we prove all things, which includes all opinions at least founded on scripture, unless we not only tolerate them, but patiently hear them, and seriously read them? If he who thinks himself in the truth professes to have learnt it, not by implicit faith, but by attentive study of the scriptures, and full persuasion of heart; with what equity can he refuse to hear or read him, who demonstrates to have gained his knowledge by the same way? Is it a fair course to assert truth, by arrogating to himself the only freedom of speech, and stopping the mouths of others equally gifted? This is the direct

way to bring in that papistical implicit faith, which we all disclaim. They pretend it would unsettle the weaker sort; the same groundless fear is pretended by the Romish clergy. At least then let them have leave to write in Latin, which the common people understand not; that what they hold may be discussed among the learned only. We suffer the idolatrous books of papists, without this fear, to be sold and read as common as our own: why not much rather of anabaptists, arians, arminians, and socinians? There is no learned man but will confess he hath much profited by reading controversies, his senses awakened, his judgment sharpened, and the truth which he holds more firmly established. If then it be profitable for him to read, why should it not at least be tolerable and free for his adversary to write? In logic

they teach, that contraries laid together more evidently appear: it follows then, that all controversy being permitted, falsehood will appear more false, and truth the more true; which must needs conduce much, not only to the confounding of popery, but to the general confirmation of unimplicit truth.

The last means to avoid popery is, to amend our lives: it is a general complaint, that this nation of late years is grown more numerous and excessively vicious than heretofore: pride, luxury, drunkenness, whoredom, cursing, swearing, bold and open atheism every where abounding: where these grow, no wonder if popery also grow apace. There is no man so wicked, but at some times his conscience will wring him with thoughts of another world, and the peril of his soul; the trouble and melancholy, which he

conceives of true repentance and amendment, he endures not, but inclines rather to some carnal superstition, which may pacify and lull his conscience with some more pleasing doctrine. None more ready and officious to offer herself than the Romish, and opens wide her office, with all her faculties, to receive him; easy confession, easy absolution, pardons, indulgences, masses for him both quick and dead, Agnus Dei's, relics, and the like: and he, instead of "working out his salvation with fear and trembling," straight thinks in his heart (like another kind of fool than he in the psalms) to bribe God as a corrupt judge; and by his proctor, some priest, or friar, to buy out his peace with money, which he cannot with his repentance. For God, when men sin outrageously, and will not be admonished, gives over chastizing them, perhaps by . .

pestilence, fire, sword, or famine, which may all turn to their good, and takes up his severest punishments, hardness, besottedness of heart, and idolatry, to their final perdition. Idolatry brought the Heathen to heinous transgressions, Rom. ii. And heinous transgressions oftentimes bring the slight professors of true religion to gross idolatry: 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12: "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." And, Isaiah xlv. 18, speaking of Idolaters, "They have not known nor understood, for he hath shut their eyes that they cannot see, and their hearts that they cannot understand." Let us therefore, using this last means, last here spoken of, but first to be done, amend our lives with all speed; lest through impenitency

we run into that stupidity which we now seek all means so warily to avoid, the worst of superstitions, and the heaviest of all God's judgments—popery.

END OF THE TREATISE OF TRUE
RELIGION.

APPENDIX.

Extracts from LORD MONBODDO'S Origin and Progress of Language.

ON THE STYLE OF MILTON.

THIS Author I have frequently mentioned before, and shall, in the sequel, quote him oftener than any other English writer, because I consider him as the best standard for style, and all the ornaments of speech that we have in our language. He was a singular man in this respect,—that he had as much original genius as any man, and at the same time, more learning than perhaps any, even of that learned age in which he lived. For, it appears from his writings, both in prose and verse, and particularly from his little tractate upon education, that his course of study had taken in the whole circle of human knowledge. His poetic genius appeared very early, both in Latin and English; and there is an elegiac epistle of his in Latin, written, as it is supposed, when he was about seventeen or eighteen years old, to his companion, Carolus Diodati, who, it seems, had pressed him much to leave London, where he was then residing, and return to the University of Cambridge, where he had been educated, which I will venture to set against any thing of the elegiac kind to be found in Ovid, or even in Tibullus. I shall only quote four

verses of it, which will give the reader some taste of the whole. It is where he speaks of his residence in London, the place of his birth:

*Me tenet urbs, reflua quam Tamesis alluit unda ;
 Meque, nec invitum, patria dulcis habet.
 O utinam vates nunquam graviora tulisset,
 Ille Tomitano flebilis exul agro !*

There can be nothing, I think, finer of the elegiac kind than in these lines. In the first, London is most beautifully and poetically described, by the circumstance of its being washed by the reflux water of the Thames. The second line has the proper cadence, as well as turn of expression, of this kind of verse; and the two last lines, for the elegance of the composition, and the sweetness of the versification, are hardly to be matched in Latin, or in any other language. It is pleasant, I think, to observe this great genius 'teneris juvenescens versibus,' to use an expression of Horace, wantoning in the soft elegiac, playing with fable and mythology, as he does in those Latin poems; and by this exercise of his young muse, preluding to his great work, which he executed in the full maturity of his age,

" Long chusing and beginning late ;"

I mean his *Paradise Lost*. To his other accomplishments he joined the advantage of travelling, and in a country which was then the seat of arts and sciences; I mean Italy, where it appears that he applied himself much to the study of the Italian Authors, particularly the poets. And his muse exercised herself in that language, as well as in Greek, Latin, and English. And though his genius was so early, and even what we may call premature; yet it did not, like other things that grow hastily, decline soon. For, at the age of sixty-two, when, besides his blindness, and the infirmities accompanying so advanced a period of life,

he was involved in the ruin of his party, and, as he himself has said,

——— Fallen on evil days, and evil tongues ;
With dangers and with darkness compass'd round,
And solitude,

he wrote the Sampson Agonistes, the last and the most faultless, in my judgment, of all his poetical works, if not the finest. And his poetic genius was as extensive as it was lasting ; for it is difficult to say whether he excels most in the heroic, the tragic, the elegiac, the lyric, the pastoral, or the anacreontic. Of this last kind is a great part of the *Comus*, which is not to be equalled for scenes of festivity, jollity, and riotous mirth, as well as for the noblest sentiments of virtue.—(*Origin and Progress of Language*, vol. iii. p. 68, Note.)

It may be objected, that in the simple compositions mentioned in the preceding chapter, the arrangement may be either way, without any injury to the sense or the perspicuity. But what shall we say to those artificial arrangements, by which the parts of speech that ought always to go together, are set often at a great distance from one another, as a verb from its nominative, or the word governed by it, or the adjective from its substantive ; by which means the mind is kept in suspense, sometimes for a great while, and the words so jostled out of their natural order, that it requires often a great deal of pains and skill to restore them to that order ; and, in short, the sentence is made little better than a riddle ? The thing will be better understood by an example ; and I will take one from the last stanza of an Ode of Horace, which Milton has translated literally, and thereby indeed shown, very clearly, that the genius of the English language will not bear such an arrangement. But the question is, Whether the genius of the Latin be equally stinted ? and, Whether there be any beauty or utility in ranging the words in so

perverse an order, as those gentlemen would call it?
The passage is as follows:—

—— Me tabulâ sacer
Votivâ paries indicat uvida
Suspendisse potenti
Vestimenta maris Deo.—*Od.* 5.

Now, according to those gentlemen, the natural and proper arrangement is that which a schoolboy learning Latin is ordered by his master to put the words in. As thus: *Sacer paries indicat tabulâ votivâ me suspendisse uvida vestimenta potenti Deo maris.* If this be elegant and beautiful, then indeed the Greeks and Romans were in a great mistake when they studied a composition the very reverse of this; for we are not to imagine, that it was the necessity of the verse, and not choice, that made them use such a composition. For, as shall be shown afterwards, it is as common in their prose writings as in their verse. And indeed it was one of the chief beauties of the Attic dialect, and which distinguished, perhaps more than any thing else, the Attic from the other Greek writers. This beauty the Romans, particularly in later times, imitated very much; for not only Horace is full of it, but even in Virgil's eclogues, where one should have expected more simplicity of style, there is a great deal of it to be found. I shall give but one instance out of many:

Hinc tibi, quæ semper vicino ab limite sepes
Hyblæis apibus florem depasta salicti,
Sæpe levi somnum suadebit inire susurro.

Of this artificial composition in English I will give an example from Milton; it is from the speech of Satan in the beginning of the second book of *Paradise Lost*:

Me, tho' just right and the fix'd laws of Heaven
Did first ordain your leader, next free choice,
With what besides in council or in fight
Hath been atchiev'd of merit, yet this loss,
'Thus far at least recover'd, hath much more
Establish'd in a safe unenvied throne, &c.

Here many objections may be made by the advocates for the natural order. In the first place Milton has taken advantage of the pronoun *I* having an accusative, and has placed it at the head of the sentence, at a great distance from its verb *established*; so that we do not know what he would be at, till we come to the sixth line; and instead of saying plainly, and naturally, "That the loss they had sustained had established him much more firmly than ever in his throne," he has contrived to express it in the most perplexed way, throwing in betwixt the verb and the word it governs, which naturally ought to have followed it immediately, whole sentences concerning the laws of Heaven, the free choice of his subjects, the achievements in battle and in council, and the recovery of their loss so far; and some of these are parentheses, such as, *with what besides, &c.* and, *thus far at least recovered*, which might be both left out in the reading, having no necessary connection with what goes before and follows, and serving only to make the connection more remote betwixt the verb and the pronoun which it governs, and by consequence the composition more intricate.

This, I think, is the opinion of those gentlemen fairly stated, and applied to one of the finest passages of our greatest poet, and which, according to my notions of style, is a perfect pattern of rhetorical composition, hardly to be equalled in English. The pronoun, that in the passage I quoted from Horace, and in this from Milton, is so far separated from its verb, and which is the great objection to the composition, is, I think, in both passages, most properly placed in the beginning, because it is of himself that the person is speaking; and therefore the pronoun is naturally made the leading word. And what is thrown in betwixt, in both passages, particularly in the English poet, is not idle words, but such as fill up the sense most properly, and give a solidity and compactness to the sentence, which it otherwise would not have. And as to the parentheses in the passage from Milton, it is well known to those who understand any thing of speaking, that if paren-

theses be not too long, or too frequent, and be spoken with a proper variation of voice, they produce a wonderful effect, with respect both to the pleasure of the ear and to the sense, which is often thrown, or, as it were, darted in, with more force than it could be in any other way.

To be convinced of the truth of what I say, let this period be taken down in the manner that a schoolboy construes the passage of Horace above quoted. Suppose, for example, it were to be put into this form: "This loss, which we have so far recovered, hath established me in my throne more firmly than the laws of Heaven, which ordained me your leader, or than even your own free choice, and all that I have atchieved in council or in battle." Now I ask any reader of taste or judgment, whether the period, thus frittered down, does not lose one half of the strength and vigour of the expression, as well as of the beauty and pomp of sound? And whether there be not wanting in it, not only that soundness which fills and pleases the ear so much of a popular assembly, but likewise that density of sense which makes such an impression, and which the critics praise so much in Demosthenes? In short, it appears to me, that by such a change, one of the most beautiful periods that ever was composed, by which Milton has deserved the praise which Cicero bestows upon poets, of studying the beauty of oratorical composition, though under the fetters of strict numbers, is rendered flat and languid, losing not only its *oratorical numbers*, but enervated in its sense.—(Vol. ii. pp. 353—359.)

Setting aside all consideration of the accents, the arrangement of the words is what gives a turn to a sentence, that is either pleasing to the ear, or uncouth and disagreeable. That this is the case in high composition must be evident to any one who will take the trouble to put the words out of the order in which the author has placed them, and take down the sentence in the manner I have taken down that fine period of Milton, in the beginning of the second book of *Paradise*

Lost, by which not only the pleasure of the ear is lost, but the sense and spirit of the composition flattened and enervated. I will give another example from the prose writings of the same author: it is the period with which he begins his *Eiconoclastes*, or answer to King Charles's *Εἰκων βασιλική*. It runs thus:—"To descant on the misfortunes of a person fallen from so high a dignity, who hath also paid his final debt both to nature and his faults, is neither of itself a thing commendable, nor the intention of this discourse." Now, let the order of the words be altered in this manner: 'It is not in itself a thing commendable, nor is it the intention of this discourse, to descant on the misfortunes of a person fallen from so high a dignity, who hath also paid his final debt both to nature and his faults.' Here the words are not only the same, but the order likewise is preserved, except that the first and last members of the sentence have changed their places. The period also is preserved; and yet what a change there is in the composition! How flat, insipid, and, as it were, supine it becomes, instead of flowing, rounded, and spirited! (Vol. iii. page 50.)

I will here add the sequel of this passage:—

'Neither was it fond ambition, or the vanity to get a name, present, or with posterity, by writing against a king. I never was so thirsty after fame, nor so destitute of other hopes and means, better and more certain to attain it; for kings have gained glorious titles from their favourers by writing against private men, as Henry VIII. did against Luther: but no man ever gained much honor by writing against a king, as not usually meeting with that force of argument in such courtly antagonists, which to convince, might add to his reputation. Kings most commonly, though strong in legions, are but weak at arguments; as they who ever have been accustomed, from the cradle, to use their will only as their right hand, their reason only as their left; whence, unexpectedly constrained to that kind of combat, they prove but weak and puny adversaries. Ne-

‘vertheless, for their sakes, who, through custom,
 ‘simplicity, or want of better teaching, have not more
 ‘seriously considered kings than in the gaudy name
 ‘of majesty, and admire them and their doings as if
 ‘they breathed not the same breath with other mortal
 ‘men, I shall make no scruple to take up (for it seems
 ‘to be the challenge both of him and all his party)
 ‘this gauntlet, though a king’s, in the behalf of
 ‘liberty and the commonwealth.’

This, I think, is a specimen of noble and manly eloquence. For, not to mention the weight of matter that it contains, and the high republican spirit which animates it, I ask those gentlemen, who despise the Greek and Roman learning, and admire only the French Authors, or some later English Writers, that they are pleased to set up as models (for Milton, I know, they think uncouth, harsh, and pedantic), whether they can produce any thing themselves, or find any thing in their favourite authors, which they can set against this passage in Milton, either for the choice of the words, or the beauty and variety of the composition? It may be considered as a *gauntlet*, that Milton, for the honor of ancient literature, has thrown down to those gentlemen, which he must be a bold man among them who will venture to take up. (Vol. iii. note, page 51.)

If my reader is not learned, let him have recourse to Milton, and study the speeches in the *Paradise Lost*, particularly those in the second book; there he will find that fine period, in the beginning of Satan’s first speech, which I have elsewhere quoted and commented upon. And there is another in the beginning of Belial’s speech in the same book, also worthy of his attention. It runs thus:—

I should be much for open war, O peers!
 As not behind in hate, if what was urged,
 Main reason to persuade immediate war,
 Did not dissuade me most.

And if he further wants an example of a good period

in prose, I think the one I have given above, from Milton's *Eiconoclastes*, may suffice. (Vol. iii. page 59.)

The reader, if he be not learned, may be satisfied with those that I have already quoted from Milton; or, if he desires longer ones, he will find great plenty of such in his controversial prose writings. (Vol. iii. page 60.)

As I do not intend to treat of ornaments of speech, that will apply to the learned languages alone, I shall mention only such figures of this kind as will apply equally to those languages and to ours; and I will begin with a well-known one, viz. *ellipsis*, which is, when one or more words are wanting, that, by the rules of grammar, are required to complete the sense.

Examples of it are so common in Greek and Latin, that I need not quote them. It is not so common in our language any more than in other modern languages. But I will give one or two examples of it from our great Milton, who wrote at a time when there was no imitation of French authors among us, nor of any other except the great ancient authors, and of the Greek more than the Roman, who were themselves considered only as imitators. The authors, therefore, of that age, endeavoured to bring our language as near to this classical standard as possible, and particularly Milton, from whom I am to take my examples. There is one passage that furnishes two examples of the ellipsis. It is where Adam, taking leave of the angel, says,

— Since to part,
Go heavenly guest, ætherial messenger,
Sent from whose sovereign goodness I adore.
Book viii. v. 645.

In the first we must supply, *it is necessary*; so that the full phrase is, *since to part is necessary*. This is an ellipsis common enough in Greek, where the word *dei*, signifying *it must be*, is understood. The other is the ellipsis of the pronoun *him*; so that the complete phrase is, *sent from him whose goodness I adore*.

commonly observed, of which I have elsewhere given an instance in that fine passage of the second book, where he describes Belial rising to speak. And, as Horace begins an ode with a parenthesis, so he begins Satan's speech, in the beginning of the second book, with one, and a very long one too, in this manner :

Powers and dominions, Deities of heaven!
 (For since no deep within her gulph can hold
 Immortal vigor, tho' oppress'd and fallen ;
 I give not heaven for lost : from this descent
 Celestial virtues rising, will appear
 More glorious and more dread than from no fall,
 And trust themselves to fear no second fate)
 Me tho' just right, and the fixt laws of heaven, &c.

I will give one other instance from Milton of a parenthesis, which I think very beautiful. It is in the Comus, where the younger brother, speaking of the situation of his sister, says,

I do not think my sister so to seek,
 Or so unprincipled in virtue's book,
 And the sweet peace that goodness bosoms ever,
 As that the single want of light or noise
 (Not being in danger, as I trust she is not)
 Should stir the constant mood of her calm thoughts,
 And put them into misbecoming plight.

The whole passage is exceedingly beautiful ; but what I praise in the parenthesis is, the pathos and concern for his sister that it expresses. (Vol. iii. p. 66.)

Our great Milton has in this, as well as in other things, faithfully copied his masters, the ancients. For, though his poetical style is, in many passages, by far the most sublime we have in English, yet it has less froth or bombast than any modern composition of the kind that I know. I have elsewhere instanced some expressions that show the modesty of his style, such as,

Battle dangerous to less than Gods ;

and,

———— Nor appear'd
 Less than archangel ruin'd.

And I will here give only one instance more: it is where he describes the rising of the council of the devils in Pandæmonium, the noise of which a less correct and judicious author would have compared to loud thunder; but he compares it to thunder heard at a distance:

Their rising all at once was as the sound
Of thunder heard remote;

Book ii. v. 476.

which is a sound not loud or strong, but awful, and very like that produced by the movement of a great multitude. (Vol. iii. p. 112.)

Milton appears to have been sensible of the defect of his subject; and, accordingly, he has been at great pains to supply it; for, in the council of the devils, in the second book, he has exhibited different characters of them in very fine speeches, the finest, in my opinion, that are to be found in English. But those devils appear only there, and are no more seen; so that Satan may be truly said to be his only character; for he is carried through the whole poem, and every where appears like himself, of which I shall give but one example out of many. It is the end of his speech, with which he concludes the debate in the council of Pandæmonium; where, after setting forth the dangers that any one must run who should undertake the discovery of the new created world, he says,

But I should ill become this throne, O peers!
And this imperial sovereignty, adorn'd
With splendor, arm'd with power, if aught proposed
And judg'd of public moment, in the shape
Of difficulty or danger, could deter
Me from attempting. Wherefore do I assume
These royalties, and not refuse to reign,
Refusing to accept as great a share
Of hazard as of honor, due alike
To him who reigns, and so much to him due
Of hazard more, as he above the rest
High honor'd sits? Go therefore, mighty powers,
Terror of Heaven, though fall'n, intend at home,

While here shall be our home, what best may ease
 The present misery, and render hell
 More tolerable: if there be cure or charm
 To respite or deceive, or slack the pain
 Of this ill mansion; intermit no watch
 Against a wakeful foe, while I abroad,
 Thro' all the coasts of dark destruction, seek
 Deliverance for us all: this enterprize
 None shall partake with me.

Book ii. v. 445, *et seq.*

The whole passage is wonderfully beautiful in every respect. But the reason why I have quoted it is, to show how he supports Satan's

——— Monarchal pride,
 Conscious of highest worth,

as he expresses it. (Vol. iii. page 131.)

The reader who is not learned in the critical art, if he has had the patience to accompany me so far in what I have said concerning all those niceties of composition, will be surprised to find that there is so much variety in this matter; and he will be still more surprised to be told, that the variety is not yet exhausted; and that, besides all the several forms and figures of composition which I have explained, relating both to the sense and the sound, there remain others without name or number, which serve to vary and adorn the composition, as well as those that have been already mentioned.

In order to help him to conceive this variety, I will take a period of some length, and show him the different ways in which it may be composed. The example I shall use, is a period that I have mentioned more than once before, viz. that of Milton in Satan's first speech in the council of devils, in the second book of *Paradise Lost*; and I will take in the whole passage, containing an argument which shows, as much as any thing in the whole work, Milton's rhetorical faculty; for by it he endeavours to prove, that hell is, at least in some respects, better than heaven:

Me tho' just right, and the fix'd laws of heaven
 Did first create your leader; next, free choice;
 With what besides, in council or in fight,
 Hath been achiev'd of merit; yet this loss,
 Thus far at least recover'd, hath much more
 Establish'd in a safe unenvied throne,
 Yielded with full consent. The happier state
 In heaven, which follows dignity, might draw
 Envy from each inferior; but who here
 Will envy whom the highest place exposes
 Foremost to stand against the Thunderer's aim
 Your bulwark, and condemns to greatest share
 Of endless pain? Where there is then no good
 For which to strive, no strife can grow up there
 From faction; for none sure will claim in hell
 Precedence; none, whose portion is so small
 Of present pain, that with ambitious mind
 Will covet more. With this advantage then
 To union, and firm faith, and firm accord,
 More than can be in heav'n, we now return
 To claim our just inheritance of old,
 Surer to prosper than prosperity
 Could have assur'd us; and by what best way,
 Whether of open war or covert guile,
 We now debate: Who can advise, may speak.

As every composition is made up of certain materials, let us consider, *first*, of what materials the composition here is made. And these are the following propositions (for there is no need to analyse it further): 1st, I was created your leader, by the fixed laws of heaven: 2ndly, I was likewise by you chosen *for* leader: 3dly, This choice was confirmed by my achievements: 4thly, But I was liable to envy while in heaven: For, 5thly, There is envy in heaven, because there is in it good for which to contend: But, 6thly, There is no envy here in hell, because there is no good to contend for. From these premises, the conclusion is drawn, that he was more established in his throne, and they in a better condition, and surer to prosper, than before their fall. These materials may be put together in the following plain manner, without any figure or other ornament of language.

Being created your leader, by just right, and
 ' heaven's fix'd laws, then by your free choice, and next

‘ by my own achievements in battle and in council, I
 ‘ am further established in this right by the loss we
 ‘ have sustained,—a loss, at least, so far recovered ; for
 ‘ by this loss, I am delivered from the danger of envy,
 ‘ which attends dignity in heaven, but which cannot be
 ‘ here, where there is no good to contend for, and where
 ‘ the highest dignity only exposes to the greatest misery.
 ‘ With the advantage, then, of greater union and firmer
 ‘ concord than can be in heaven, we are in a better
 ‘ condition, and surer to prosper, than we were before
 ‘ our fall.’

This is the plain sense of the passage ; but it will be somewhat ornamented, if it be turned in this way :

‘ What could have established me more in my throne
 ‘ than this very loss that we have sustained, thus far,
 ‘ at least, repaired ? Before, indeed, I was created your
 ‘ leader by the fixed laws of heaven. This creation was
 ‘ confirmed, first by your free election, next by my own
 ‘ achievements in council and in battle ; but still I was
 ‘ in danger, from that envy which attends all superior
 ‘ dignities in heaven. Now that is at an end ; for who
 ‘ will envy him who is here condemned to suffer the
 ‘ greatest share of pain ? And how can there be con-
 ‘ tention, when there is no good for which to contend ?
 ‘ With the advantage then of so much greater unani-
 ‘ mity and concord than we could enjoy in heaven, let
 ‘ us return to claim our just inheritance, being now
 ‘ assured to prosper more than prosperity could have
 ‘ assured us.’

Or thus, with a little more ornament, and more of the rhetorical cast.

‘ As usurpation, the want of the people’s concur-
 ‘ rence in the election of a monarch, and the defect of
 ‘ personal merit in the monarch himself, make a throne
 ‘ insecure, so on the other hand, nothing establishes a
 ‘ throne more than just right and fixed laws, the free
 ‘ election of the people, and the achievements of the
 ‘ monarch in council and in battle. All these advan-
 ‘ tages I enjoy. But there is one thing which makes
 ‘ my throne still more secure : What is that ? It is this

‘very loss that we have sustained, by which that envy which attends superior dignities in heaven is at an end. For who will here envy him who is condemned to suffer the greatest misery? With more unanimity, therefore, and firm concord than can be in heaven, let us deliberate how we are to repair our losses, thus far already recovered.’

Other turns might be given to this sentence; but these will suffice to show, first, how much more copious the language of Milton is, and how much more rounded, compact, and nervous his composition is, than any that I, at least, can give to this passage.—(Vol. iii. p. 137.)

Let us see how this notion of the sublime will apply to some famous passages that have been quoted as instances of the sublime; and I will begin with the words of Moses, giving an account of the creation of the world by Almighty God, a subject, no doubt, in its nature most sublime: ‘And God said, let there be light, and there was light.’ The thing to be expressed here is the act of Omnipotence creating at once, and by a simple fiat, the finest and most subtile of all material things:

Ethereal, first of things, quintessence pure.

Par. Lost, B. vii. v. 244.

Such an act, so far exceeding all human comprehension, was not easy to be properly expressed; for, as the same author says,

Immediate are the acts of God, more swift
Than time or motion; but to human ears,
Cannot without process of speech be told;
So told, as earthly notion can receive.

Book vii. v. 176.

To endeavour to adorn with words such a thought would be to degrade it. Moses, therefore, has expressed it in the simplest, and, at the same time, the noblest manner, by which he has told us, as well as could be told by *process of speech*, that the thing was

immediately done by the word of the Almighty. And though the words be as simple as possible, yet it may be observed, that there is a beauty and an emphasis in the repetition of the word *light*; for the thought would not have been so well expressed, if it had stood thus: ‘God said, let there be light, and it was so.’ Accordingly Milton, in translating the passage into verse, has not neglected this beauty:

Let there be *light*, said God, and forthwith *light*
Ethereal, first of things, quintessence pure,
Sprung from the deep.

B. vii. v. 243.

And as it is thus properly expressed by Moses, it could not, I think, have been so expressed, but by a man who had a just conception of so great a power.—(Vol. iii. p. 291.)

EXTRACTS FROM THE EDINBURGH REVIEW,
No. lxxxiv. pp. 310–324.

Versification in a dead language is an exotic, a far-fetched, costly, sickly imitation of that which elsewhere may be found in healthful and spontaneous perfection. The soils on which this rarity flourishes, are in general as ill suited to the production of vigorous native poetry, as the flower pots of a hot-house to the growth of oaks. That the author of the *Paradise Lost* should have written the *Epistle to Manso*, was truly wonderful. Never before were such marked originality, and such exquisite mimicry, found together. Indeed, in all the Latin poems of Milton, the artificial manner indispensable to such works is admirably preserved; while, at the same time, the richness of his fancy, and the elevation of his sentiments, give to them a peculiar charm, an air of nobleness and freedom, which distinguishes them from

all the writings of the same class. They remind us of the amusements of those angelic warriors who composed the cohort of Gabriel:

- ‘ About him exercised heroic games
- ‘ The unarmed youth of heaven. But o’er their heads
- ‘ Celestial armoury, shield, helmet, and spear,
- ‘ Hung bright, with diamond flaming and with gold.’

We cannot look upon the sportive exercises for which the genius of Milton ungirds itself, without catching a glimpse of the gorgeous and terrible panoply which it is accustomed to wear. The strength of his imagination triumphed over every obstacle. So intense and ardent was the fire of his mind, that it not only was not suffocated beneath the weight of its fuel, but penetrated the whole superincumbent mass with its own heat and radiance. (P. 310.)

We often hear of the magical influence of poetry. The expression in general means nothing, but, applied to the writings of Milton, it is most appropriate. His poetry acts like an incantation. Its merit lies less in its obvious meaning than in its occult power. There would seem, at first sight, to be no more in his words than in other words; but they are words of enchantment. No sooner are they pronounced, than the past is present, and the distant near. New forms of beauty start at once into existence, and all the burial-places of the memory give up their dead. Change the structure of the sentence; substitute one synonyme for another, and the whole effect is destroyed. The spell loses its power; and he who should then hope to conjure with it, would find himself as much mistaken as Cassim in the Arabian tale, where he stood crying ‘Open Wheat,’ ‘Open Barley,’ to the door which obeyed no sound but ‘Open Sesame!’ The miserable failure of Dryden in his attempt to re-write some parts of the *Paradise Lost* is a remarkable instance of this.

In support of these observations, we may remark, that scarcely any passages in the poems of Milton are more generally known, or more frequently repeated,

than those which are little more than muster rolls of names. They are not always more appropriate or more melodious than other names. But they are charmed names. Every one of them is the first link in a long chain of associated ideas. Like the dwelling-place of our infancy revisited in manhood,—like the song of our country heard in a strange land, they produce upon us an effect wholly independent of their intrinsic value. One transports us back to a remote period of history. Another places us among the moral scenery and manners of a distant country. A third evokes all the dear classical recollections of childhood, the school room, the dog-eared Virgil, the holiday, and the prize. A fourth brings before us the splendid phantoms of chivalrous romance, the trophied lists, the embroidered housings, the quaint devices, the haunted forests, the enchanted gardens, the achievements of enamoured knights, and the smiles of rescued princesses.

In none of the works of Milton is his peculiar manner more happily displayed than in the *Allegro* and the *Penseroso*. It is impossible to conceive that the mechanism of language can be brought to a more exquisite degree of perfection. These poems differ from others as otto of roses does from ordinary rose water, the close-packed essence from the thin diluted mixture. They are indeed not so much poems, as collections of hints from each of which the reader is to make out a poem for himself. Every epithet is a text for a canto. (P. 311.)

The *Comus* is framed on the model of the Italian Masque, as the *Samson* is framed on the model of the Greek Tragedy. It is certainly the noblest performance of the kind which exists in any language. It is as far superior to the *Faithful Shepherdess*, as the *Faithful Shepherdess* is to the *Aminta*, or the *Aminta* to the *Pastor Fido*. It was well for Milton that he had here no Euripides to mislead him. He understood and loved the literature of modern Italy. But he did not feel for it the same veneration which he entertained

for the remains of Athenian and Roman poetry, consecrated by so many lofty and endearing recollections. The faults, moreover, of his Italian predecessors, were of a kind to which his mind had a deadly antipathy. He could stoop to a plain style, sometimes even to a bald style; but false brilliancy was his utter aversion. His muse had no objection to a russet attire; but she turned with disgust from the finery of Guarini, as tawdry and as paltry as the rags of a chimney-sweeper on May-day. Whatever ornaments *she* wears are of massive gold, not only dazzling to the sight, but capable of standing the severest test of the crucible. Milton attended in the *Comus* to the distinction which he neglected in the *Samson*. He made it what it ought to be,—essentially lyrical, and dramatic only in semblance. He has not attempted a fruitless struggle against a defect inherent in the nature of that species of composition; and he has therefore succeeded wherever success was not impossible. The speeches must be read as majestic soliloquies; and he who so reads them, will be enraptured with their eloquence, their sublimity, and their music. The interruptions of the dialogue, however, impose a constraint upon the writer, and break the illusion of the reader. The finest passages are those which are lyric in form as well as in spirit. ‘I should much commend (says the excellent Sir Henry Wotton, in a letter to Milton) the tragical part, if the lyrical did not ravish me with a certain doric delicacy in your songs and odes, whereunto, I must plainly confess to you, I have seen yet nothing parallel in our language.’ The criticism was just. It is when Milton escapes from the shackles of the dialogue, when he is discharged from the labour of uniting two incongruous styles, when he is at liberty to indulge his choral raptures without reserve, that he rises even above himself. Then, like his own good genius bursting from the earthly form and weeds of *Thyrsis*, he stands forth in celestial freedom and beauty; he seems to cry exultingly,

‘ Now my task is smoothly done,
I can fly, or I can run,’

to skim the earth, to soar above the clouds, to bathe in the Elysian dew of the rainbow, and to inhale the balmy smells of nard and cassia, which the musky wings of the zephyr scatter through the cedared alleys of the Hesperides.

There are several of the minor poems of Milton on which we would willingly make a few remarks. Still more willingly would we enter into a detailed examination of that admirable poem, the *Paradise Regained*, which, strangely enough, is scarcely ever mentioned, except as an instance of the blindness of that parental affection which men of letters bear towards the offspring of their intellects. That Milton was mistaken in preferring this work, excellent as it is, to the *Paradise Lost*, we must readily admit. But we are sure that the superiority of the *Paradise Lost* to the *Paradise Regained*, is not more decided than the superiority of the *Paradise Regained* to every poem which has since made its appearance. But our limits prevent us from discussing the point at length. We hasten on to that extraordinary production, which the general suffrage of critics has placed in the highest class of human composition.—(P. 314.)

The spirits of Milton are unlike those of almost all other writers. His fiends in particular are wonderful creations. They are not metaphysical abstractions. They are not wicked men. They are not ugly beasts. They have no horns, no tails, none of the fee-faw-fum of Tasso and Klopstock. They have just enough in common with human nature to be intelligible to human beings. Their characters are like their forms, mocked by a certain dim resemblance to those of men, but exaggerated to gigantic dimensions, and veiled in mysterious gloom.

Perhaps the gods and demons of Æschylus may best bear a comparison with the angels and devils of Milton. The style of the Athenian had, as we have remarked, something of the vagueness and tenor of the Oriental

character; and the same peculiarity may be traced in his mythology. It has nothing of the amenity and elegance which we generally find in the superstitions of Greece. All is rugged, barbaric, and colossal. His legends seem to harmonise less with the fragrant groves and graceful porticoes in which his countrymen paid their vows to the God of Light and Goddess of Desire, than with those huge and grotesque labyrinths of eternal granite in which Egypt enshrined her mystic Osius, or in which Hindostan still bows down to her seven-headed idols. His favourite gods are those of the elder generations—the sons of heaven and earth, compared with whom Jupiter himself was a stripling and an upstart—the gigantic Titans, and the inexorable Furies. Foremost among his creations of this class stands Prometheus, half fiend, half redeemer, the friend of man, the sullen and implacable enemy of heaven. He bears, undoubtedly, a considerable resemblance to the Satan of Milton. In both we find the same impatience of control, the same ferocity, the same unconquerable pride. In both characters also are mingled, though in very different proportions, some kind and generous feelings. Prometheus is hardly superhuman enough. He talks too much of his chains and his uneasy posture: he is rather too much depressed and agitated. His resolution seems to depend on the knowledge which he possesses, that he holds the fate of his torture in his hands, and that the hour of his release will surely come. But Satan is a creature of another sphere. The might of his intellectual nature is victorious over the extremity of pain. Amidst agonies which cannot be conceived without horror, he deliberates, resolves, and even exults. Against the sword of Michael, against the thunder of Jehovah, against the flaming lake, and the marl burning with solid fire, against the prospect of an eternity of unintermittent misery, his spirit bears up unbroken, resting on its own innate energies, requiring no support from any thing external, nor even from hope itself!—(P. 321.)

Traces indeed of the peculiar character of Milton may be found in all his works; but it is most strongly displayed in the SONNETS. Those remarkable poems have been undervalued by critics who have not understood their nature. They have no epigrammatic point. There is none of the ingenuity of Filicaja in the thought, none of the hard and brilliant enamel of Petrarch in the style. They are simple, but majestic records of the feelings of the poet; as little tricked out for the public eye as his diary would have been. A victory, an expected attack upon the city, a momentary fit of depression or exultation, a jest thrown out against one of his books, a dream, which for a short time restored to him that beautiful face over which the grave had closed for ever, led him to musings which, without effort, shaped themselves into verse. The unity of sentiment, and severity of style, which characterise these little pieces, remind us of the Greek Anthology, or perhaps still more of the Collects of the English Liturgy;—the noble poem on the Massacres of Piedmont is strictly a collect in verse.

The sonnets are more or less striking, according as the occasions which gave birth to them are more or less interesting. But they are, almost without exception, dignified by a sobriety and greatness of mind to which we know not where to look for a parallel. It would, indeed, be scarcely safe to draw any decided inferences as to the character of a writer, from passages directly egotistical. But the qualities which we have ascribed to Milton, though perhaps most strongly marked in those parts of his works which treat of his personal feelings, are distinguishable in every page, and impart to all his writings, prose and poetry, English, Latin, and Italian, a strong family likeness.—(P. 324.)

THE END.









